

REMARKS

Status of the Application

Claims 1-24 are the claims that have been examined in the application. Claim 10 is objected to. Claims 3, 4 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-7, 10-15 and 21-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xiong et al. (US Publication 2003/0214481). Claims 8, 9, 16-18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xiong et al. (US Publication 2003/0214481) in view of Frid (US Patent 6,075,517).

By this Amendment, Applicants are amending claims 4,10, and 21 and are adding new claim 25.

Preliminary Matters

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for foreign priority and indicating that the certified copy of the priority document has been received.

Applicants also thank the Examiner for considering and initialing the references submitted in the Information Disclosure Statement filed June 29. 2005.

Applicants note that the Examiner has not indicated that the drawings filed June 29, 2005 are accepted. **Applicants respectfully request the Examiner indicate their acceptance in the response to the Office Correspondence.**

Claim Objections

Claim 10 is objected to because of informalities.

Applicants hereby amend claim 10 -- and analogously, claim 21 -- in order to overcome the objection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 3, 4 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicants hereby amend claim 4 to cure the noted deficiency.

With regard to claim 3, Applicants note to the Examiner that line two recites “input scenario information,” not “input sensor information.” Thus, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

With regard to claim 10, Applicants note to the Examiner that an inventor may be his/her own lexicographer, and that according to page 15, lines 22-25 of the specification, an edge is triggered by a change in a port value, where the port values are signals outputted from the sensors of the finger device. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is hereby respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7, 10-15 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xiong et al. (US Publication 2003/0214481).

Claim 1 recites, in part, “adaptively configuring the 3D input device based on the recognition results.” The Examiner alleges that Xiong discloses each of the aspects of claim 1, or that it would be obvious to modify Xiong in a manner which would disclose all of the aspects of claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Xiong discloses a finger worn and operated input device, wherein the input device 21 is fit for a user’s thumb, and composes a sensor 27 and a coordination system 28. See FIG. 1 of Xiong. Upon a user touching an index finger or middle finger to the sensor, the input device is capable of controlling a personal computer in a manner similar to a computer mouse. However, Xiong fails to disclose that the input device is adaptively configured based on recognized finger positions of the finger device. Rather, Xiong is configured to operate in the same manner regardless of the finger position, as input device 21 is limited to a single manner of operation. In other words, the input device 21 in Xiong fails to disclose that the input device itself may have multiple finger positions (it is only worn on the thumb, and the sensor and coordination system are disposed in a single location). Therefore, the input device 21 is not adaptively configured based on the recognition results of finger positions of the finger device. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over the applied art as Xiong fails to disclose all of the elements of claim 1.

Claims 7 and 15 recite similar elements to claim 1, and are patentable for reasons analogous thereto. Claims 2-6 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

Claim 10 recites, in part, “determining, from the acquired sensor signals, whether at least a predetermined number of edges are detected.” The Examiner alleges that Xiong discloses each of the aspects of claim 10, or that it would be obvious to modify Xiong in a manner which would disclose all of the aspects of claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 10 indicates that a user is indicated to be wearing the 3D input device when at least a predetermined number of edges are detected. Page 15, lines 22-25 of the specification indicate that an edge is triggered by a change in a port value, where the port values are signals outputted from the sensors of the finger device. In other words, when the signal outputted from the sensors of the finger device changes, an edge is formed. If a predetermined number of edges are detected, then it is recognized that the user is wearing the 3D input device.

Xiong, on the other hand, fails to disclose that any recognition regarding movement is detected in determining if the user is wearing the 3D input device. As such, Xiong cannot disclose, or suggest, determining ... whether at least a predetermined number of edges are detected. Therefore, claim 10 is patentable over the applied art.

Claim 21 recites similar elements to claim 10, and are patentable for reasons analogous thereto. Claims 11-14 and 22-24 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

The Examiner, on page 4 of the instant Office Action, indicates that the subject matter of claim 19 is disclosed by Xiong. However, as noted on page 6 of the instant Office Action, the Examiner concedes that Xiong fails to disclose the recited reset information. Therefore, claim 19 is patentable over the applied art, as Xiong fails to disclose all of the elements of claim 19.

Claims 8, 9, 16-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xiong et al. (US Publication 2003/0214481) in view of Frid (US Patent 6,075,517).

Claims 8 and 9 are dependent from claim 7. Because Xiong fails to disclose all of the aspects of claim 7, and because Frid fails to cure the deficient disclosure of Xiong, claims 8 and 9 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 7.

Claims 16-18 are dependent from claim 10. Because Xiong fails to disclose all of the aspects of claim 10, and because Frid fails to cure the deficient disclosure of Xiong, claims 16-18 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 10.

Claim 20 is dependent from claim 19. Because Xiong fails to disclose all of the aspects of claim 19, and because Frid fails to cure the deficient disclosure of Xiong, claim 20 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 19.

New Claim

Applicants hereby add new claim 25, which depends from claim 1, and is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency therefrom.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Dion R. Ferguson/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Dion R. Ferguson
Registration No. 59,561

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 30, 2008